

RELEVANCE OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING IN THE ENGINEERING DISCIPLINES, UNIVERSITY OF GUILAN

ABBAS SADEGHI¹, NADER OFOGHI², SETAREH AZIZI³ & ZAYNAB AKBAR HOSSENI⁴

¹ Associate Professor, Department: Educational Sciences, Faculty of Humanities, University of Guilan, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department Social Sciences, Faculty of Humanities, University of Guilan, Iran

³ MA in Clinical Psychology, Free University of Rasht Unit, City of Rasht, Guilan, Iran

⁴ MA student in Counseling, Free University of Sciences and Researches, Unit of Tehran, City of Rasht, Guilan, Iran

ABSTRACT

In this study, the effecting teaching models based on input have been analyzed from students in the Faculty of Engineering, University of Guilan. In the first stage, interview with the 40 first year students has been done to express their opinions about good teaching. Then, from the population of 3000, 379 students have been selected from the Faculty of Engineering University of Guilan through stratified sampling based on Morgan table (1970). They were asked to answer a questionnaire by the favorable factors affecting teaching in terms of (a) Main and (b) a subsidiary of the ranking. Also an important difference between teaching and being special and different groups for the entire sample was considered Faculty of Engineering. According to the results with regard to discipline their views and experiences have had significant differences, but overall the disciplines had similar comments. Ranking in the factor analysis also showed that the effecting teaching model centered learning and teaching centered on two general factors is taken into consideration.

KEYWORDS: Student, University, Good Teaching, Learning

Original Article

Received: Jun 21, 2016; **Accepted:** Jul 11, 2016; **Published:** Jul 27, 2016; **Paper Id.:** IJESRAUG2016010

INTRODUCTION

We know that any evaluation requires a comparison with the norms of teaching is good teaching. In terms of evaluation of teaching in universities, multiple sources are recommended. For example, Gold Schmitt (1988) and Perelberg (1999) indicate that training of practitioners and scientists worry that because the main function of the Teaching and Higher Education is seen as the most technical, skillful and teachers should be responsible and be held accountable (2005).

In studies to assess the quality of teachers and teaching their common interest is usually students. Second, it is more confidence that the cause of multiple sources of information used. Murphy et al (2009) comments that consists of subject knowledge, design learning experiences, interaction with students and course management are summative evaluation model to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of teaching and learning have offered to work through the process of teaching done folder. Ramsden (2005) states that the purpose of teaching is simple and it is possible to learn learners. Teaching is always trying to change the perception learners so that they begin to conceptualize phenomena and ideas are like scientists and mathematicians.

Several researchers such as Biggs and Tang (2004), Stephen and et al (2002), and (1998), Ramzden 1995 and 1991) also found that one of the problems universities, disregarding the quality of its teaching and research

activities. (Darling Hammond, 1997) Barth et al (2008) believe that to improve the quality of education should be to improve the quality of teaching and learning at the same time the basic attention.. Salehi (2000) believes that knowledge and effective teaching quality is an important indicator of the quality of lecturers. Hanard (2009) also factor in the choice of university teaching quality by students knows measured day. Since the main task of teaching and learning is so universities need quality information and improve the quality of teaching and learning to think and act. (Miller, 2001). Johnson et al (1995) argued that teaching is a theoretical model, but the model is acceptable to some extent desirable teaching is in conformity with accepted standards old and outdated know, cannot be credibility.

The Quality of Learning

Higher education institutions that can have several other tasks, according to Fulton (1973) is the most important task of education. The training in the easiest as it can be considered as an input-output system in which a number of students by level of certain kinds of knowledge in interaction with instructors, books, equipment, and etc are located innovation program is maintained and to understand their role learning environment that provides opportunities for interactive learning and strategic interventions to support teacher provides in order to consolidate the training period, the electronic technology used Has been used to assess the quality of education combined.

After the introduction of the models described the experimental data collection and analysis, Astanskv and Mosat (2015) in this regard, to provide a model of analysis about the quality of the programs and the impact on the perception students have about the education system. It should be noted that the evaluation of learning cannot score reflects the quality of learning or understanding them. For example, Entwistle and et al (2000) suggest that how training can be the result of activity to have a high score even when something is not understood. Therefore, the question is, what quantity of learning is considered as an indicator of the ability and competence of teaching? And whether the quality of learning outcomes is desirable teaching? According to Jones (1999) and different expectations of different courses to college students' reasons are. This leads to different attitudes, different expectations of the most critical to least important than teaching materials, etc. The final score is obtained, should be evaluated.

The Quality of Teaching

According to Saljo (1998) and Mac Cormick (2003) limits the tasks of learning, individualized student perceptions of learning and knowledge and to facilitate the implementation of strategies Field of study, teaching quality are affected. Also, because the quality of student learning, depends largely on observations of people and learning different conditions and different opinions about the "quality" of teaching, learning and offers the ideal model to achieve quality creates, describe the quality the learning difficult. It is evident that optimal content for a lesson, is very different. But what is not clear is whether utilities evaluate learning and teaching by two different groups of similar students?

Important Factors

Greenwood and others (2003) suggest teachers a lesson tend to agree with the views of students. The acceptability of the pattern of satisfactory teaching, mainly through implicit patterns of desirable teaching that students seek it, is determined. A useful model of good teaching should be useful variables is similar to the above-mentioned variables. For extracurricular activities and decisions that a teacher should adopt its activities specifies.

Students learn about good teaching as someone who is supposed to also assist in identifying the features of good

teaching or not? They can also help them understand and learn about the things you do not talk. (Ramsden, 2004). The state of educational outcomes, gender, and induce different programs (and changes) are described in the quality of teaching. Osama and RadId (2015) believed that it is not matched reduce students' motivation related to multiple factors between them. The misconception of the teaching process, lack of interest and loss of interest and lack of cooperation between learners, teachers and class school overcrowded conditions led to a decrease in interest teachers.

Sin and Sarkar (2015) concluded that these characteristics such as experience, gender, and education content knowledge and general education have a significant impact on students. Accommodation near school teacher, professional competence of teachers and teachers' attitudes towards teaching and students and teaching practices, including. In addition, when the students were asked to express the characteristics of a good teaching, they usually do what their teachers are doing the count and usually include the following:Organize teaching, to stimulate student interest, explanation or understanding, empathy with the needs of the students, give feedback, clear goals and encourage independent thinking. The list of personal characteristics are professors.

OBJECTIVES

The aim of this study was to investigate the views of students, Faculty of Engineering, University of Guilan about effective teaching and secondary objectives include:

- Compare the views of different groups of students about effective teaching
- Find the major and minor characteristics of effective teaching.
- -Find the gap and distance of the characteristics of effective teaching
- -Separation characteristics of teacher-centered or student-centered teaching effective

Research Questions

- What are the characteristics of effective teaching?
- Are there significant differences between students' views are important and critical factors being there mean?
- Field teaching in engineering is more teacher-centered or student-centered?

METHODOLOGY

In order to minimize the impact of these secondary factors, the sample includes those engineering students who have begun their second year. These comments are based on experiences obtained during the first year at university.

Instruments

- **Interview**

Carrying out first year students together and we talk with them. (Table 1).

- **Speech:** For example, twice per week for each lesson
- Provided training or laboratory and workshop discussions usually once a week
- During the final exams

- **Questionnaire**

During the week of enrollment in the academic year, the second year students were asked to rank these four cases based on the following:

- The amount of importance of effective teaching
- The specificity of these cases based on teaching experience in the first year.

A 9-point scale from very agrees that the number 1 and number 9 was against it. More than 80 percent of students rated these factors.

It was designed in such a way that importance of being together were ranked. It is important to find the distance between the particular and help researchers. However, this issue has already Tal Levin et al (2001) confirmed the find the distance between these two factors was emphasized.

Data Analysis

Table 1, information about the general sample of students, 356 teachers in the system. The combination of these examples are based on strings is as follows: Civil 50, 53 mechanics, electronics 100, PC 71, textile 40, Power 42

$$\text{Distance factor} = \frac{\text{Main - Minor}}{\text{Main}} \times 100$$

Then measure the distance to the amount of students is taken as an indication of where the items being special, is less than the original items being considered is located.

Table 1: Main and Minor and Distance Factors (and Corresponding Respectively) on the Effective Teaching of Students (N = 356) Questions: the Distance of the Main Teachers of Secondary Rating

Complete and Comprehensive Knowledge of the Subject.	Main	Rank	Sub-Being	Distance Factor	Rank
2. Keen and interested in what he is teaching.	2.20	1	3.58	62.7	8
3. Speaks in clear and understandable.	2.43	3	4.46	83.5	2
4 for clear-on the blackboard writes.	2.30	2	4.64	93.9	1
5. Behavior and earnestly is friendly with students.	2.98	18	4.40	47.6	11
6. Sense of humor.	3.21	24	4.47	39.2	25
7. His concern is that students have a good performance in the classroom.	3.73	33	4.81	28.9	33
8. Interesting conversations and have fun doing it.	3.26	26	4.96	52.1	27
9-an open door policy, which means students are encouraged to contact him and see him.	4.52	38	5.73	26.7	34
10-different than the students do not collide and prejudices.	2.75	8	4.73	0.72	10
11-If wrong, it is prepared to accept.	2.76	9	4.62	67.4	6

Table 1: Contd.,

12-talking is completely ready.	2.86	14	4.42	54.5	14
13. An active researcher explains that the original content and is aware of the latest developments.	2.53	6	3.78	49.4	19
14. Attempt that students receive feedback.	3.92	36	4.84	14.2	35
15. The use of other viewpoints and discuss it.	2.85	13	4.83	69.5	5
16. Raises your comments definite.	2.98	19	4.58	53.7	15
17-subject with the implementation of modern society.	4.20	37	4.20	0	40
18. Encourages students to learn self-reliant and themselves.	3.34	29	4.55	36.2	28
19. Does not assume that students already know all the material.	3.14	22	4.25	35.35	29
2. Introduces the resources available.	2.78	10	4.37	57.2	12
21. Subject to escape US sanctions during class and outside of class defines delicacies.	2.83	12	4.59	62.2	9
22-material covered in a moderate way (ie some of the aspects that should be emphasized more, some less).	4.67	39	5.02	7.5	39
23. Encourages students to challenge his point of view.	3.14	22	4.38	39.5	24
24-offer students also incorporates lessons.	3.54	31	5.28	49.15	20
25-student agitation and incitement to think.	3.88	35	5.58	43.8	23
26-contents are organized so that students learn themselves.	2.78	11	4.56	64.0	7
27. Complex issues logically and understandable offers.	3.23	25	4.95	53.3	16
28. The recent advances in this field are discussed.	3.13	21	4.61	47.3	21
29 ideas from related subject areas, describes.	2.93	16	4.40	50.2	18
30-goals provides for clear and crisp.	3.51	30	4.70	33.9	31
31-in during teaching, the important point to emphasize.	2.96	17	4.47	51.0	17
32-of talking about social issues, it his responsibility.	2.46	5	3.82	55.3	13
33-some courses related to educational and teaching has passed.	5.00	40	5.64	56.6	38
34-to satisfactorily answered students' questions.	3.75	32	4.75	33.1	32
35. Booklets good book introduces the curriculum.	2.45	4	4.32	76.3	3
36-on methods of measurement and evaluation of students are discussed.	2.92	15	4.24	45.2	22
37-something to offer that are readily available in textbooks.	3.04	20	4.21	38.4	30
38-Description him in a way that can be easily recorded.	3.92	27	4.56	16.3	26

Table 1: Contd.,						
39-character and ethics is annoying and disturbing.	2.60	7	4.40	69.2	4	
40-relaxed and less gets angry.	3.79	34	4.49	18.5	37	

Table 2: The Distance and Scores of Different Disciplines the Students about Effective Teaching Questions Civil Mechanical Electrical Industrial Computer Electronics

Electronics	Computer	Industrial	Electrical	Mechanical	Civil	Q
(2) 81.0	(6) 64/9	(9) 71.8	(7) 55.3	(10) 65.25	(11) 62.0	1
(1) 89.8	(5) 66.2	(2) 108	(2) 74.2	(2) 107	(3) 79.1	2
(5) 75.2	(1) 88.0	(1) 113	(1) 78.0	(1) 110	(1) 97.8	3
(7) 69	(8) 61.1	(2) 108	(21) 36.9	(5) 08.1	(22) 45.3	4
(12) 60.2	(28) 33.7	(30) 38.6	(18) 41.7	(27) 36.5	(28) 38.2	5
(32) 26.4	(37) 23.4	(36) 30.8	(29) 27.1	(32) 30.9	(32) 32.1	6
(28) 35.6	(24) 43.4	(19) 54.5	(20) 38.4	(17) 53.3	(27) 41.2	7
(33) 25.5	(36) 23.3	(27) 41.1	(32) 22.5	(35) 25.6	(38) 2.0	8
(18) 50.0	(13) 51.5	(10) 70.7	(10) 46.8	(19) 51.5	(6) 67.5	9
(2) 81.0	(12) 51.8	(20) 52.7	(3) 23.7	(18) 53.2	(2) 82/0	10
(4) 78/0	(16) 48.5	(31) 38.0	(6) 58.3	(16) 54.1	(12) 58.4	11
(10) 62.2	(27) 34.4	(8) 79.1	(9) 48.7	(21) 47.9	(23) 43.7	12
(38) 13.6	(30) 31.5	(38) 13.4	(34) 18.1	(37) 13.8	(31) 33.01	13
(17) 52.6	(15) 50.5	(6) 83.6	(5) 61.10	(8) 67.8	(4) 75.8	14
(20) 46.6	(20) 47.2	(25) 45.9	(14) 44.4	(15) 54.3	(10) 62.5	15
(40) 0	(40) 0	(40) 0	(40) 0	(40) 0	(40) 0	16
(24) 42.4	(25) 42.5	(21) 51.2	(28) 29.0	(29) 35.1	(33) 28.6	17
(30) 33.3	(29) 31.8	(33) 35.9	(30) 24.1	(23) 43.5	(29) 37.7	18
(6) 69.6	(9) 54.5	(7) 83.5	(19) 39.7	(9) 66.0	(15) 55.4	19
(9) 63.9	(4) 66.8	(14) 63.1	(16) 43.2	(7) 69.1	(8) 63.8	20
(37) 15.0	(39) 7.8	(37) 19.4	(37) 7.1	(39) 1.0	(39) 1.0	21
(31) 30.4	(32) 29.9	(22) 50.0	(26) 31.6	(31) 31.2	(20) 50.2	22
(14) 57.7	(21) 46.5	(26) 42.9	(16) 43.2	(19) 51.5	(17) 53.0	23
(29) 34.4	(22) 44.0	(32) 37.5	(27) 31.5	(25) 40.8	(19) 50.5	24
(16) 53.5	(56) 64.9	(13) 68.4	(11) 46.4	(6) 74.4	(9) 62.7	25
(19) 48.6	(19) 47.3	(12) 68.5	(25) 32.3	(14) 55.2	(13) 56.1	26
(22) 44.1	(33) 27.0	(15) 62.2	(13) 46.6	(24) 42.8	(16) 24.2	27
(21) 45.8	(18) 47/8	(23) 47.4	(15) 43.6	(12) 60.1	(18) 50.4	28
(23) 43.8	(26) 35/0	(34) 35.5	(33) 20.1	(30) 31.3	(30) 34.7	29
(15) 57.0	(11) 52.5	(17) 58.8	(23) 35.5	(13) 59.2	(21) 48.1	30
(11) 61.4	(14) 51.2	(16) 61.9	(12) 46.0	(11) 61.5	(14) 55.9	31
(34) 19.6	(38) 14.2	(39) 13.3	(39) 3.4	(38) 11.5	(37) 13.6	32
(27) 36.2	(31) 30.7	(18) 56.7	(35) 616.5	(21) 46.7	(34) 27.4	33
(8) 66.1	(2) 70.1	(4) 67.7	(4) 61.3	(4) 8.2	(5) 74.5	34
(25) 41.7	(17) 48.0	(11) 70.0	(24) 34.6	(26) 38.3	(25) 42.0	35
(26) 37.0	(23) 43.5	(24) 47.2	(31) 23.6	(34) 26.1	(26) 41.4	36
(36) 17.3	(10) 53.5	(28) 39.6	(22) 35.9	(27) 36.5	(24) 42.8	37
(13) 60.1	(3) 69.4	(5) 87.6	(8) 82.3	(3) 85.2	(6) 67.5	38
(39) 8.4	(37) 20.4	(35) 33.5	(38) 5.2	(36) 20.0	(35) 20.2	39
(35) 19.5	(34) 25.5	(29) 38.9	(36) 12.1	(33) 28.6	(36) 18.3	40

Note: Ratings Are Given in Brackets

Table 2 shows that although there is general agreement between the groups, but differences have been considered: The causes are caused by the strings are different. On the whole, the responses of students of electricity in the first question, the distance was the highest, while it is lowest replies to the Department of Electronics. One possibility is that

perhaps students compared to students of electrical power and construction, have experienced better teaching.

- Like many students of power electronics group of students who had taken the same courses.
- A majority of students have also had similar courses, has been proposed. According to Jones (1999) this may be due to different expectations of different groups that have overshadowed their harvest.

Question No. 4: To Be Clear on the Blackboard Writes

This questionnaire construction and electronics students as relatively trivial and unimportant is graded mechanical groups while other groups (especially computers and electronics groups or civil) as it is a very important and significant component in teaching different structure considered desirable that the majors have been caused and lead to the following conclusions: students are attracted by working with blackboard is also very common and common

Question No. 10: The Proportion of Students Not Deal Prejudice

The questions students' textile, construction and electricity compared to a much lower level has been graded. They discussed their evidence.

Question 19: Does Not Assume That Students Already Know All Things

Electronics and textile students and civil groups in comparison with other departments, as a case of this importance has been graded. Teachers' incorrect assumptions about what students already know and as a result its "start from a wrong place" for teaching that students show a serious lapse in point. While similar expectations about concepts and formulas official of the students in the mail, is not required and not required. Hajnal (2002) in this regard and believes that similar results were a group of students usually do not know too much beforehand.

Question No. 37: The Content Offers That Are Readily Available

Industrial and Civil Engineering students have a great importance to this case is that due to the characteristics of teaching in the first year

All students exposed to the same educational opportunities, lecture / lab and they tended final exam curriculum should be easily accessible. However, the nature of the specific field of study and experience the opinions and attitudes of their students is affected.

Dimensions Desirable Teaching

Lower value for the roots of lies, 5/1 that the maximum number of five factors were extracted.

One of the key features and major patterns of effective teaching to students, general public and they are. The desirable teaching on all aspects of good practice was diagnosed. However, there are two distinct types of appropriate teaching model for students to participate in general. Tutor main focus is placed on the first and second type of student learning is emphasized. But when it is considered that the whole group of students. 3 of instructor-based, student-centered and performance obtained from this analysis are:

- **The Teacher Orientation**

32 questions, 40 questions were related to this factor is the most important factor, according to the percentages in parentheses to the storage rotated concerned are as follows:

Professor speaks in clear and understandable to class (81/0)

Master your presentations complete the comprehensive preparation (77/0)

Master has full knowledge of all aspects of its subject (77/0)

In the above case largely on the role of schools according to the characteristics, abilities and his behavior is emphasized in a formal setting class.

- **Student Orientation**

30 questions out of 40 questions, focusing on storage is significantly linked to this factor is the most important shows the following:

Master your students that stimulate their thinking. (70/0)

Professor material is organized in such a way, so the students can learn on their own. (70/0)

Professor encourages students to learn self-reliant and themselves. (64/0) in the above questions to the student as a learner focus and create an environment to put the class. Thus, according to the students, they can also learn self.

- **On Entertainment**

10 The question obviously is the most important of these factors are stored as follows:

Professor managers that do fun and interesting presentations. (71.0)

Master class during the escape US sanctions issue and defines delicacies. (70/0) is a professor humorous (60/0)

In the above cases, the role of recreation in the learning environment is considering the interesting point is that students distinguish it from teacher-centered and student-centered teaching being considered.

Leaflets professor of curriculum provides a good (short lectures, etc.). (75/0)

Professor quiet and not be angry. (70/0)

Teacher during lessons and courses, to emphasize important points (67/0)

The second factor was to stimulate students to challenge accepted views. Questions related to it are as follows:

Professor encourages students to challenge their views. (74/0)

Master of views other than his own use and discussed it. (67/0)

Comments definite and raises its own master. (58/0)

Another factor was related to the selection and organization of content. Subsets of these factors include:

Professor material is organized in such a way that students learn themselves. (70/0)

Master has provided updated information and the latest advances in this field are discussed. (58/0)

Professor of facts and ideas related fields, describes. (51/0) some of the most important factors for this factor structure on which special emphasis was made were:

An active researcher Professor has argued that the original content and is aware of the latest advances (73/0)

Professor to talk about social issues it his responsibility. (67/0)

It is important to master your subject connect community today. (60/0)

CONCLUSIONS

Research like this Ramsden (1999) and Brew and McCormick (2003) and Henard (2009) have shown that students in different groups, the issue of teaching and learning in different ways to set up. This understanding, along with other incarnations like, Saljo (1998) reasons

Logical students to attend college, Jones (1999) and the change and transformation of the landscape and their views about teaching and learning environments. Nevertheless, the question is whether there are aspects that all students in their preferred models of good teaching include? If so, this and other questions is what the dimensions of experiences are, expectations and reasons for different groups of students into consideration, which leads to different dimensions patterns of taught? These two questions are often used in studies on students' opinions about good teaching, is not clear. Forecast teaching skills of the characteristics of the character.

The survey of participants found the workshop very useful. All participants reported being more interested in teaching programs.

Solomon (1986), Pugh (1987); Crawford and Bradshaw (1988); Greenwood et al. (2003).have given. In most of these factors, skills, understanding, the structure is considered jointly.

If you have not defined the teaching and learning environment, teaching model cannot be considered favorable for teaching and learning process.in his mind or not?

Findings of Kenongyang and colleagues (2015) also showed that critical thinking and problem solving skills, teamwork / group work skills to the remarkable prediction that the percent of variance in quality education helps. As a result, soft skills teachers need to be added in order to create a quality and effective teaching practice.

Research Tudor (2015) to study the role of teaching and research activities in the development of professional skills of students took place. To do this, this study aimed to identify students' attitudes about the role of school activities in professional skills training. In this regard, this study some educational variables set for vocational training and skill development, namely education as curriculum content analysis, teaching practice, research activities in which the students involved.

Are specific training activities (Scientific Sessions student, school competitions, organizing activities with elementary students and preschoolers etc.) is considered.

According to Naftolyn (1993) Vidovich (2000) Brew and McCormick (2003), many faculty members feel that there is recreation in their judgment about effective teaching is effective teaching. Perhaps this is a correct understanding even the best-educated and most fastidious audience in a teaching session or speakers via an entertaining performance and elegant, are affected. But current research shows that the students' actions are completely distinct entertainment is teaching. It is important rating and low for questions related to the entertainment show them that they have not been very affected the performance of fun.

According to Jones (1999) when he talks disperse faculty presentations, the students are concerned. But research of this students had less concern about losing something. The overall structure is subject to so much to offer all students a compact, organized, detailed accurate means of doing so. This shows the difference in the nature of academic fields.

According to Gibbs et al (1986), Murphy et al (2009) often, students strategies put numbers in formulas to perform calculations and obtain the correct result is correct. While the variety of teaching models, differences in factors on which we have previously discussed, reflect. In fact, different thematic structures and expectations of the students, the differences between the main and secondary variables are being created.

It is interesting that the pattern of teaching to students is positively associated with everyday social relations. Jones (1999) Fink (2008) argue that these students are very career-oriented and represent their understanding of the track after the profession must move it. Selection and organization of content that students are considered to be of the same type of human sciences, but with less confidence can be considered. In the study, Ahmed and Ltib (2015) show that professional teaching in practical work in education as a means to improve current practices used to teach.

In Pazdanya et al (2015) to explore the concept of "social skills" from the viewpoints play an important role in the field of training. The results report that the definition of the concept of conversational skills, tolerance, empathy and solidarity that is the benefit of learners.

Conditions in this study, mainly lecture and laboratory sessions for freshmen was. In this environment, students generally observed that two completely different model of effective teaching that is one of them being student-centered. In which their students can learn effectively and efficiently. Other models in terms of performance, capability and competent teacher-centered teaching shows that the professors teaching that content is presented and interpreted. After teaching there is also an entertainment function.and reforms in this field causes the three-dimensional model is considered.

REFERENCES

1. Adnan Ahmad, Nadia Ab Latib. *Teaching in Automotive Practical Task: Practices in Vocal- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 204, 24August 2015, Pages 299-290
2. Anderson, L, (2004), *Increasing teacher effectiveness*, UNESCO publication, Paris
3. Biggs J and Tang, C, (2007).*Teaching for quality learning at University*, Open University Press -Brew, Angela and McCormick, Bob (2003). "Student Learning and an Independent Study Course," *Higher Education* 8:443-451.
4. Carmen Paz Tapia-Gutierrez, Sixto Cubo-Delgado. (2015) *Social Skills for the Teaching Performance in Chile: Perceptions of Teachers and Principals*. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 197, 25. Pages 1069-1073
5. Crawford, P. L. and Bradshaw, H. L. (1988). "Perceptions of Characteristics of Effective University Teachers: a Scaling Analysis, " *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 28:1079-1085•
6. Gibbs, Graham, Morgan, Alistair and Taylor, Liz (1986). "Understanding Why Students Don't learn," S.M.G. Report 5. I.E.T. The Open University Milton Keynes.
7. Goldschmidt, Marcel L. (1978). "The Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching in Higher Education" *Higher Education* 44:596-604
8. Greenwood, Gordon E., Gridges, Charles M. Jr., Ware, William B. and McLean, James E. (2003). "Student Evaluation of College Teaching Behaviors Instrument: A factor Analysis," *Journal of Higher Education* 44:596-604.

9. Darling-Hammond, L. (1997) .*doing what matters most: investing in quality teaching*. NY: national commission on teaching and America's future
10. Delavar, Ali,(1993) *Thoughts about the evaluation of faculty members*, *Journal of Psychology and Education*, University of Allameh, Tabatabaei, Volume I, Number 2
11. Entwistle and et al (2000) *Strategies for Research and Development in Higher Education*. Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger.
12. Fink, D. (2002) *Improving the evaluation of college teaching*. In K. Gillespie (ED) .*A guide to faculty development* (p.46-58). Bolton, MA: Anker.
13. Fink, D. (2008). *Evaluation teaching: A new approach to an old problem*. In S. Chadwick-blossey and D.R. Robertson (Eds), *to improve the academy: resources for Faculty, instructional, and organizational development*, 26, pp: 3-21.san Francisco: josser- bass.
14. French, Wendell. *The characteristics of effective teaching from the students' perspective* translator Ali Delavare, *Journal of School Psychology*, Educational Sciences, Allameh Tabatabaei University, first period Number 2, 1993.
15. -Fulton, L ", the producer of the Office of Public Education, Higher and Research" published by the PBO. Tehran 1994.
16. Hajnal, J. (2002). *The Student Trap*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Isaacson, Robert L., McKeachie, Wilbert J. and Henard. Fabrice. (2009), *insight into quality of teaching quality in higher education*. OECD publication, www, oecd.org/edu
17. Hergenhan, No. R. Olson. Mitvaj. (1998) *Introduction to the theory of learning*, translator Ali Akbar Seif, publishing era, Tehran. Iran
18. Islam Osma, Mohamed Radid. (2015) *Analysis of the Students' Judgments on the Quality of Teaching Received: Case of Chemistry Students at the Faculty of Sciences Ben M'sik*. Social and Behavioral Sciences, Volume 197, ,25 Pages 2228-2223
19. Jones, John (1999). *Students' Views of the Roles of a University*, Higher Education 8: 513-254.
20. Levinthal, C.F., Lansky, L.M. and Andrews C. (2001). "Student Evaluations of Teacher Behaviors as Estimations of Real-ideal Discrepancies: A Critique of Teacher Rating Methods," *Journal of Educational Psychology* 92: 104-109
21. Martin Misut, Katarina Pribilova. (2015) *Measuring of Quality in the Context of e-Learning*. Social and Behavioral Sciences, Volume 177, 22, Pages 312-319
22. Miller. Errol, (2001), *quality assurance in higher education in the commonwealth Caribbean*, university of West Indies .Journaica.
23. Murfy, John and colleagues (2008), *Teaching Quality Evaluation in Higher Education: check some point*, the Journal of Curriculum Studies, the first year (5), Tehran
24. Murphy, T et al, (2009) *toward a summative system for the assessment of teaching quality in higher education*. International journal of teaching and learning in higher education. Volume 20, number2, 226-236
25. Naveh Ebrahim .A. and V. karimi (2006); *A study of relationship between triple skills of department chairs and improvement of educational quality*; quarterly journal of research and planning in higher education, Vol.12, NO.39, pp.61-78(in Persian)
26. Naftulin, D.H., Ware, J.E. and Donnelly, F.A. (1993). "The Dr. Fox Lecture: A Paradigm of Educational Seduction, " *Journal of Medical Education* 48:630-635.
27. Perlberg, Arye (1999). *Evaluation of Instruction in Higher Education: some Critical Issues*, Higher Education 8:141-157.
28. Pogae, E.G. (1987). "Students' Ratings of the 'Ideal Teacher', " *Improving College and University Teaching* 15:133-136.

29. Ramsden, P, (1998), *learning to lead in higher education*, newyork, Routledge publication.
30. Ramsden,P.(1991) ,*A performance indicator for quality in higher education: the course Experience questionnaire, studies in higher education*, NO.16,pp:129-49.
31. Ramsden, P. and Martin, F (1996), *Recognition of Good University Teaching Policies from an Australian study, Studies in Higher Education*, No 21, pp 299-315
32. Ramsden. P. (2005) < *learning to teach in higher education*, New York, routledge publication
33. Raoofi, Shahin, et al., (2010), *a new form of theoretical teaching quality evaluation of teachers based on the views of stakeholders and the six principles of classical scholarship*, Hormozgan Medical Journal, Volume 14, Number 3, Pages 176-107
34. Renu Singh, Sudipa Sarkar. *Does teaching quality matter? Students learning outcome related to teaching quality in public and private primary schools in India*. International Journal of Educational Development, Volume 41, March 2015, Pages 153-163
35. Rosen Shine, B and Stevens, R (1986). *Teaching functions, Handbook of research on teaching .3 edition*, McMullan mc
36. Rumery, Robert E.-Johnson, Henry C.Jr. Rhodes, Dent M. and. (1995). *The Assessment of Teaching in Higher Education: Part I: A Critical Retrospect. Part II: A Proposal*, " Higher Education 4:173-199,273-303.
37. Salehi, Sh,(2000) *effect of clinical supervision on the faculty teaching quality at nursing and midwifery school of Isfahan university, Iranian journal of medical sciences*. Vol 1, no1, pp: 47-56
38. Salehi, M. et al., (2009), *view scientific Hewitt members and students about academic evaluation and criteria of the teaching faculty at the University of Medical Sciences, Journal of Medical Sciences*, Volume 11, Issue 4, Pages 63-75
39. Saljo, Roger (1998). "Learning About Learning," Higher Education 8:443-451.
40. Seyf, Ali Akbar, "methods of measurement and evaluation in education", publishing era, Tehran, 1378
41. Sharifian, F. Ahmad Reza Nasr, Abedi, "Identification of effective teaching indicators of universities and institutions of higher education and its Accomplishment in Isfahan University", Journal of Research and Planning in Higher Education, Nos. 37 and 38, 2005.
42. -Siegel, L. (1998). "The Contributions and Implications of Recent Research Related to Improving Teaching and Learning," in O. Milton, and E.J. Shoben, (eds.), *Learning and the Professors*. Ohio: Ohio University Press.
43. Solomon. D (1986). "Teacher Behavior Dimensions, Course Characteristics and Student Evaluation of Teachers, " American Educational Research Journal 3: 35-47
44. Stănescu Monica, Nely Mușat *Quality Analysis Model of the E-learning Training System for Sports Occupations. Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 180, 5 May 2015, Pages 1351-1356
45. Tang Keow Ngang, Ching Shiau Yie, Siti Asiah Md Shahid *Quality Teaching: Relationship to Soft Skills Acquisition Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 191, 2 June 2015, Pages 1934-1937.
46. Tudor Loredana Sofia (2015) *the Role of School Activities in Training /Development of the Professional Skills Specific for the Teaching Profession. Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 180, 5 May 2015, Pages 984-989